

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were pending at the time of examination. Claims 1, 5 and 9 have been amended. Claims 2, 6 and 10 have been canceled. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks the Examiner for the personal interview that was conducted with the applicant's representative Fredrik Mollborn on August 4, 2005, and where the Examiner's supervisor Examiner Salad was also present. Claim 1 was discussed, and the differences with respect to the cited U.S. Patent Nos. 6,738,975 and 6,487,566. It was agreed that specifying that the operations recited in claim occur on the server side and incorporating claim 2 into claim 1 appears to overcome the art of record. Some further remarks are set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,738,975 to Yee et al (hereinafter "Yee") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,566 to Sundaresan (hereinafter "Sundaresan"). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, describes a method for server side filtering of a message in a distributed network. That is, claim 1 describes a method where a message is filtered on the server where the message resides, before it is passed to a client. Furthermore, step (a) of claim 1 requires that a JMS provider determines whether the message is to be sent to the topic subscriber.

Steps (b) and (c) recite "determining if the message is an extensible markup language (XML) message that conforms to an XML schema specified by a selected XSLT filter;" and "transforming the XML message to form a modified XML message," respectively. The Examiner agrees that these steps are not shown in Yee, and relies uses Sundresan to cure this deficiency. Sundresan teaches converting instances of XML documents from one format to another, but this it is not done using XSLT filters. Instead Sundresan uses a pattern matching language (PML) (col. 6, lines 29-37). This is clearly different from the subject matter recited in steps (b) and (c).

As noted in previous responses and in the application, the service side filtering relates to several advantages that cannot be accomplished by conventional techniques. For example, the filtering makes it possible to transmit only selected portions of the XML message "over the

wire," which preserves network bandwidth and improves latency (see, for example page 7, lines 5-10 of applicant's specification). For at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.


Independent claims 5 and 9 relate to an apparatus and to a computer program product, respectively, and have limitations that are similar to the limitations of claim 1. Thus, for reasons substantially similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the applicant respectfully contends that the rejection under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) of independent claims 5 and 9 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4, 7-8, and 11-12 all depend from independent claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

The applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Fredrik Mollborn
Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300